## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Hon. Bernard A. Friedman

and

Case No. 10-CV-13101

SIERRA CLUB,

Intervenor-Plaintiff,

v.

DTE ENERGY COMPANY AND DETROIT EDISON COMPANY,

Defendants.

TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE

Detroit, Michigan - Friday, July 10, 2020

## Appearances:

Michael B. Buschbacher
Thomas Benson
Kristin M. Furrie
U.S. Department of Justice
Environmental and Natural Resource Div.
950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530
202-305-2075
Email: michael.buschbacher@usdoj.gov
On behalf of Plaintiff

F. William Brownell
Harry M. Johnson, III
Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037
202-955-1500
Email: bbrownell@huntonak.com
On behalf of Defendant

Suzanne Jacques, Official Court Reporter email: jacques@transcriptorders.com

Appearances (continued):

Michael J. Solo DTE Energy Company One Energy Plaza Detroit, MI 48226 313-235-9512

Email: solom@dteenergy.com

- - -

I N D E X

\_ \_ \_

Proceeding
Telephonic Status Conference 3

```
Detroit, Michigan
 1
 2
               Friday, July 10, 2020
 3
               11:00 a.m.
 4
 5
                 (All parties appearing telephonically.)
                 THE COURT: Good morning. Judge Friedman on the
 6
 7
     line. I understand we have some other folks on the line.
 8
    Let's start with the plaintiff. If I may have appearances.
 9
     Let's start with the plaintiff. Who do we have?
                 MR. BUSCHBACHER: You have the United States.
10
11
    My name is Michael Buschbacher from the Justice Department,
12
     and I have with me on the phone Tom Benson and Kristin
13
    Furrie.
                 THE COURT: Okay. What's your name? One more
14
15
    time.
16
                 MR. BUSCHBACHER: Sorry. Michael Buschbacher.
17
                 THE COURT: Okay. And you're going to be
18
     speaking today, Michael?
19
                 MR. BUSCHBACHER: I'm sorry, what was that?
20
                 THE COURT: You'll be speaking?
21
                 MR. BUSCHBACHER: I will.
22
                 THE COURT: And are there other people on the
23
    line from the plaintiff?
24
                 MR. BUSCHBACHER: Yes. Thomas Benson and
25
    Kristin Furrie.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. Tell me who's on for the
 1
     Sierra Club.
 2
 3
                 MR. FISK: Good morning, Your Honor. This is
 4
     Shannon Fisk on behalf of Sierra Club.
 5
                 THE COURT: We have everybody for the
 6
     intervenors as well as for the plaintiff.
 7
                 Okay. So tell me who is here for the defense.
 8
                 MR. BROWNELL: For the defense, Your Honor,
 9
    William Brownell on behalf of DTE, and I am joined on the
     phone by Keith Johnson and Michael Solo.
10
11
                 THE COURT: Okay. And our court reporter for
12
    today, is it Suzanne?
13
                 COURT REPORTER: Yes, Judge, it's Suzanne.
14
                 THE COURT: When you speak, some of the voices I
15
     recognize because I've been doing this case for so long, but
16
     Suzanne has not. But when you speak, just say your name so
17
     she knows who you are.
18
                 Johnetta, are you on the phone?
19
                 THE CLERK: Yes, Judge.
20
                 THE COURT:
                            Okay. Johnetta is my case manager.
21
     And Eva, are you on the phone?
22
                 LAW CLERK: Yes, Judge. Good morning.
23
                 THE COURT: Good morning. And Steve, are you
24
    there?
25
                 LAW CLERK: Yes, I'm here, Judge.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So we know who is all on the phone. We have some matters up today, and I have spent a lot of time going over everything. I put it on the back shelf because I thought it was resolved by paperwork. I'm going to maybe start, I'll just put it on the record where I think we are, and then we'll go to each party, and please tell me if I'm right, wrong, what's left. As to the original case, my understanding as to that case is that the United States has lodged a consent decree, and that the process of that consent decree is starting in terms of the statutory and administrative (indiscernible) done, (indiscernible) complete assume that at that point by the Court that part of the case. COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. THE COURT: Next part, my understanding again is that the intervening parties as well as the defendant have also entered into a separate agreement and the Sierra Club has filed a motion, and there's no response to that motion yet but we do have (indiscernible) --COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, Judge. (Phone connection cutting out.) THE COURT: -- that will accomplish

(indiscernible) resolve one of two things. Number one, that it will overrule that (indiscernible) a private matter. That's the issue if (indiscernible) all in agreement, the

So I think I'll hear from the plaintiffs first.

That's where we stand. Do you have anything to add to that?

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUSCHBACHER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Michael Buschbacher for the United States. Just one correction from us. We did actually file our response early. We wanted to give you an opportunity to see that before today's hearing, so we filed that on Wednesday, and we just brought out the red pens and got it to fit within 25 pages, so that should be on file now with the Court.

THE COURT: I didn't go to the CM/ECF to check anything. I have everything here, but that's great. I have not seen it.

MR. BUSCHBACHER: And the only other thing I would say is that these things are -- the two things are connected in some respect, the government consent decree and the side agreement. There is a provision in the government's three party consent decree that sets forth kind of the procedures that we agreed to in negotiating Sierra Club and DTE for how they would submit their side agreement to the Court for review.

THE COURT: However, you have consented to that agreement, have you not, the side agreement?

MR. BUSCHBACHER: No, we have not consented to it. Our consent decree that we lodged with the Court indicates that we were reserving the right to object to it. After looking at their request, at their motion to enter, we went through extensive internal review, it went up to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

number two official at the Department of Justice, and we concluded that we did indeed want to file an objection. So our response would take issue with the procedural requests made in the side agreement, and also takes issue with the substance of what Sierra Club was trying to attain. THE COURT: Okay. Now, that is what's outstanding at this time. So the Court has to decide that

issue, and once I decide that issue, whether -- whichever way I go, that would resolve the litigation between Sierra and DTE.

MR. BUSCHBACHER: Yes, Your Honor. The way that agreement works, and I'm sure Shannon can speak to this, as well, if their agreement is entered or otherwise approved without entering it, that agreement includes a release that kicks in once the three party CD is approved. If it's not approved by the Court, Sierra Club and DTE have agreed to file a stipulation to dismiss Sierra Club's amended complaint.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUSCHBACHER: So one way or the other, it will go away.

THE COURT: Okay. I notice one of the pleadings was 800 some-odd pages. I've never --

MR. BUSCHBACHER: That's largely comments, Your Honor, on the three party consent decree. We have also

included a nice little summary that covers all the unique aspects of those in 14 crisp pages.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I understand. As I said, I kind of put it on the back burner, and the last couple days I've been kind of working on it somewhat.

How about DTE, anything you want to add? MR. BROWNELL: Yes, Your Honor. This is William I was going to suggest the Sierra Club should go first, and then I can address both what Sierra Club and the government have to say.

THE COURT: Sierra Club.

MR. FISK: Yes, Your Honor. Shannon Fisk for Sierra Club. Yes, I believe your summary was accurate overall. Just a couple points of clarification.

The first, just the main contested thing is between all three parties, Sierra Club did sign that consent decree. The second, on the separate agreement, yes, so we have filed a separate agreement. We had originally proposed to include those terms within the main consent decree. Department of Justice decided it wouldn't go that route. And then we were fine, Sierra Club was fine not filing the separate agreement with the Court (indiscernible) separate agreement. But pursuant to the main consent decree, we are required to by DOJ.

And so, you know, you now have our motion

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
regarding the separate agreement to either interpret or to
simply take notice of it, depending on whether you find it's
a private settlement agreement or not, and then the
government has filed their response. Our reply is due
August 3^{rd}, and we intend to file it by that date. And
then I would simply note that also, you know, the
(indiscernible) on the separate agreement will obviously
take care of this case. But DTE can speak to this more, but
as they noted, they intend to file a separate agreement, you
know, regardless of the outcome here, so those commitments
will occur. And so, you know, I think, you know, it's not
clear why the Court would need to rule on the separate
agreement.
            THE COURT: But I have to because there's a
        I understand what you're saying as a practical
motion.
matter, but (indiscernible).
            COURT REPORTER: Judge, I can't hear you.
            THE COURT: I'm sorry. I had the phone pushed
over a little bit. I'm going to have to figure it out
because it's a brand new phone system, and it should be
working great.
            So as a practical matter, I'm not sure that it
will make any difference, but I have to decide it.
            Okay. DTE.
            MR. BROWNELL: Your Honor, this is William
```

Brownell for DTE.

From DTE's standpoint, the primary objective is to resolve the action and put it behind the company as soon as possible. DTE has, therefore, agreed with the government and with Sierra Club regarding what they would do to resolve the case and as to the specifics, and DTE plans to proceed with these agreed—to actions regardless of whatever form the final agreements take.

But in DTE's view, at this point, all parties have agreed to resolve the claims of the case and to dismissal of the case with prejudice. This would resolve the case, so in our view, the main CD with the government should be entered and the case should be dismissed with prejudice as soon as possible.

I recognize that you have to decide what happens with the separate agreement, but we see that as a separate issue and should not affect the entry of the main consent decree and dismissal of the case.

THE COURT: Well, I think the main consent decree has to be entered, and then we have to start doing the process. I thought we entered it, but if we hadn't entered it, there's no reason not to.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  BUSCHBACHER: Your Honor, Michael Buschbacher for the United States, if I may.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUSCHBACHER: We do not think that dismissal is appropriate. We think two things should be considered together.

THE COURT: I don't suggest dismissal at this point. I think enter that agreement and get it going, and then when I decide the issue of the Sierra Club, whether to (indiscernible) or not, then through that order, either way I go, then I guess it really depends. If I make it private, then there's no reason to, based upon the consent judgment, not to dismiss it because I can retain jurisdiction for purposes of forcing the consent decree. But if there is —the Sierra Club is involved and that one is not private then I'm going to have to take a look at that, too, because there's a question of enforcement. However, DTE has just told us they're going to do it no matter what, so at that point we'll take a look at it, but I think it's fine.

MR. BUSCHBACHER: Your Honor, we don't think so. The issue here is whether -- it's about whether the federal government is in charge of deciding what quantitative relief is appropriate.

THE COURT: You're right. I mean, I don't want to make a decision, but -- I have no idea, so let's wait and see what happens.

MR. FISK: Your Honor, just real quick. Shannon Fisk again.

I mean, we agreed that the issue would probably be moot given that DTE has committed to do these (indiscernible). But I'd also note that this agreement does not seek federal court jurisdiction or enforcement over the agreement. Would not have to, you would not have to try to make that happen under the separate agreement because it's not sought in the agreement itself.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know enough about it, but I think the main consent agreement should be entered if it hasn't, and then I will now wait for the reply, and when we get the reply, we'll get on top of it right away and we'll get that out. And then once I decide that issue, then we can have one more conference, rather than briefing it and so forth, and talk about dismissal, non dismissal, enforcement, you know, things of that nature. We'll decide the motion as quickly as we can.

MR. BROWNELL: Your Honor, this is William Brownell. Just to make a point about the Sierra Club intervention, Sierra Club has agreed in the main CD with the government, which Sierra Club has signed, as well. Sierra Club has agreed to that main consent decree, and they've also indicated in that consent decree that if you decide not to enter the separate agreement they will stipulate to dismissal of the case in any event.

THE COURT: So we're home free. Hold on, my

1 cell phone is ringing. 2 (Brief pause.) THE COURT: Anyhow, let me decide the motion, 3 4 and then we'll decide how we'll handle it. 5 MR. BUSCHBACHER: Your Honor, Michael 6 Buschbacher again. That sounds fine to us. 7 I think when you read our brief you'll see the main concern we have is about circumventing the government's 8 9 role as the lead environmental enforcer, and so that ties 10 into all these matters about whether they can do it anyway, 11 and all those sorts of things. So I just wanted to clarify 12 that point. But we are okay so long as the Court is going 13 to consider our objection. THE COURT: Oh, absolutely. Again, I'll 14 15 consider everything I have before me. I'll wait for the reply, and, as soon as I get the reply, we'll start working 16 17 on it right away, we'll get you an opinion. And then I'll 18 know it better. You know, I haven't read everything, I've 19 read mainly your introduction, but I will start now. We're 20 home for the duration, so I have lots of time. 21 MR. BROWNELL: Your Honor, Bill Brownell again. 22 Just as a final observation. I just wanted to 23 confirm that regardless of whether you enter the decree or 24 not, if you don't enter the decree, we'd be fine to continue

to work with us to benefit the local community even after

25

```
the case to dismissed with prejudice. I just wanted to be
 1
     clear on that.
 2
 3
                 THE COURT: Good, I think that's good.
 4
                 Anything else that we should be talking about?
 5
                 MR. BUSCHBACHER: Your Honor, I just want to
 6
     make sure, but the motion for the page limit on reply, was
 7
     that granted?
 8
                 THE COURT: Granted I'll sign that order.
 9
                 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you, Your
10
     Honor.
11
                 THE COURT: Okay. Stay healthy, stay cautious.
12
                 (Proceedings concluded at 11:21 a.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I, Suzanne Jacques, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date set forth. 7/28/2020 s/Suzanne Jacques Suzanne Jacques, RPR, RMR, CRR, FCRR Date Official Court Reporter Eastern District of Michigan Case No. 10-CV-13101